

# EXHIBIT F



**Bricker & Eckler**  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
COLUMBUS • CLEVELAND  
CINCINNATI-DAYTON

**BRICKER & ECKLER LLP**  
100 South Third Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291  
MAIN: 614.227.2300  
FAX: 614.227.2390

www.bricker.com  
info@bricker.com

Joseph R. Dreittler  
614.227.2347  
jdreittler@bricker.com

JOHN F. BIRATH, JR.  
MICHAEL S. HOLMAN  
RICHARD C. SIMPSON  
JOHN P. BEAVERS  
DAVID G. BAKER  
JERRY E. NATHAN  
MARSHALL L. LERNER  
DONALD R. KELLER  
KAREN MUELLER MOORE  
ALAN J. ROSS  
STEVEN R. KERBER  
GORDON W. JOHNSTON  
DAVID A. ROGERS  
CHARLES H. WATERMAN III  
MICHAEL K. GIRE  
JAMES A. RUTLEDGE  
DAVID C. SPALTER  
G. SAMUEL WAMPLER  
RANDALL E. MOORE  
JOHN W. COOK III  
JAMES P. BURNES  
ELISABETH A. SOUEGLIA  
JEFFERY E. SMITH  
JOSEPH R. DREITLER  
KENNETH C. JOHNSON

DIANE M. SIGNORACCI  
LUTHER L. UGGETT, JR.  
MARK R. CHILSON  
MARTHA POST BAXTER  
CRAIG A. HADDOX  
SUSAN B. GREENBERGER  
WILLIAM T. CONARD II  
ROBERT C. RAFFERTY  
JERRY ORMES ALLEN  
H. RANDY BANK  
QUINTIN F. LINDSMITH  
ANNE MARIE SFERRA VORYS  
CATHERINE M. BALLARD  
GORDON F. LITT  
SUE WYSKIVER YOUNG  
JAMES J. HUGHES III  
FRANK L. MERRILL  
KURTIS A. TURNELL  
MARIA J. ARMSTRONG  
BETSY A. SWIFT  
JACK ROSATI, JR.  
SUSAN E. GEARY  
SYLVIA LYNN GILLIS  
JAMES F. FLYNN  
PRICE D. FINLEY

BOBBIE S. SPRADER  
KIMBERLY J. BROWN  
FAITH M. WILLIAMS  
CHRISTINE M. POTH  
LAURA G. ANTHONY  
NELSON M. REID  
ALLEN R. HILLWORTH  
VLADIMIR P. BELO  
EMMETT M. KELLY  
ALEXANDER M. BROWN  
MATTHEW L. STOUT  
JAMES S. GRAY  
WARREN I. GRODY  
AMY STRAKER BARTEMES  
SUSAN L. OPPENHEIMER  
KATHERINE SPIES GIUMENTI  
JOHN F. FURNISS  
JAMES P. SCHUCK  
MARK E. EVANS  
TERRENCE O'DONNELL  
MIRANDA C. MOTTER  
DANE A. GASCHEN  
CHRISTOPHER N. SWANK  
ELIZABETH C. STOCK  
NATALIE T. FURNISS

CHRISTOPHER L. McCLOSKEY  
JENNIFER M. NELSON CARNEY  
DOUGLAS L. SHEVELOW  
CHRISTOPHER N. SLAGLE  
SCOTT W. DAVIS  
E. ROD DAMISSON  
CAVETT R. KREPS  
TODD O. REUTZEL  
PAUL S. RUTTER  
GREGORY J. KRABACHER  
C. ALLEN SHAFFER  
DIANA S. BROWN  
DANIEL C. GIBSON  
OYANGO A. SNEEL  
ERIC S. BRAVO  
RACHEL L. WYATT  
MOLLY E. HEALD  
DAVID M. JOHNSTON  
DEBRA L. A. SCHRADER  
ROSHIDA A. DOWE  
JONATHAN T. BROLLIER  
LISA M. KATHUMB  
LANA M. KNOX  
MELISSA MARTINEZ BONDY  
JOSHUA J. NOLAN

JOHN CALES BELL  
MATTHEW W. WARNOCK  
FRANCISCO E. LUTTECKE  
SHADYA Y. YAZBACK  
CATHERINE J. BAIRD  
LAURA M. ZAREMSKI  
RACHEL A. MULCHAEY  
C. CHRISTOPHER BENNINGTON  
ANDRIA M. BECKHAM  
ANDREW BALCAR  
MARGARET M. BOMBERGER  
  
OF COUNSEL  
THOMAS R. SANT  
ROBERT H. KATZ  
KIMBALL H. CAREY  
RAYMOND C. HEADEN  
ALVIN E. MATHEWS, JR.  
THOMAS J. O'BRIEN  
CLAIRE TURCOTTE  
CHARLES H. WALKER (retired)

February 18, 2008

FOR SETTLEMENT  
PURPOSES ONLY

Glenn F. Ostrager, Esq.  
Ostrager Chong Flaherty & Broitman P.C.  
570 Lexington Avenue  
New York 10022-6894

Re: Harry Winston, Inc. v. Bruce Winston Gem Corp.

Dear Glenn,

Thanks for calling and sending us a proposal of several outline points to resolve this matter. We appreciate that. As mentioned during our call, I hope you (and your client) understand that the new owner (which is a N.Y.S.E. traded company) of Harry Winston, Inc. ("HWI") has a very different perspective on trademark protection than during the time the company was privately owned.

By that I mean there is certainly nothing "personal" with respect to your client. On the other hand, as a subsidiary of a public company, HWI is aggressively taking action to protect its intellectual property and investment. While I am not at liberty to go into details, your client is not the only entity that HWI is currently involved with, and there will likely be several more matters within the next year. All of that is a prelude to responding to your points.

As you so aptly pointed out during our call, this matter relates to a trademark opposition, not a civil suit to enjoin use. My client originally filed this case to prevent Bruce Winston Gem Corp from acquiring an "asset" in the nature of a federal trademark registration that could be freely transferred, licensed or otherwise disposed of and be entitled to certain legal presumptions both during Mr. Bruce Winston's life and thereafter. To the extent that Mr. Winston (or a successor) engaged in activities that would constitute grounds for a civil suit, we have always reserved them, as your client has reserved its claim of common law rights.

EXHIBIT

tabbies

J

**Bricker & Eckler**  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Glenn F. Ostrager, Esq.  
Page 2

Although I have no knowledge of probate law, my concern about your first proposal is that it would not end the problem – and is the reason we filed this Opposition to begin with. That is, Mr. Bruce Winston (or his company) would acquire and own a registration as an “asset”. Even if we had an agreement that it would not be transferred during his lifetime, upon Mr. Winston’s death the registration would become part of his estate, or there could be a claim to this asset. Neither of us wants the unfortunate litigation in the past to resume upon Mr. Winston’s death. HWI certainly does not want to affirmatively agree to anything that might find itself in litigation with Mr. Winston’s estate.

Your letter refers more than once to Mr. Bruce Winston reserving his “common law” rights, and we believe that he owns at least part of a business. Given that you propose Mr. Bruce Winston retain all of his common law rights, we would propose that the simplest way to end the current controversy is for him to simply file an abandonment of this application, either without our consent or with our consent, but agree in the latter case not to re-file another application.

In return, my client would agree that so long as the Bruce Winston Gem Corp. was controlled and operated by Mr. Winston (Bruce Winston), his wife or his children, HWI would not object to the use of his name on certain jewelry items under certain restrictions to be negotiated, including that there be no “Bruce Winston” retail stores, no sales in retail stores or internet sales. Upon the death of the last to survive among Mr. Winston, his widow or his children, there would be no further use of the name Bruce Winston or “Winston”. The parties could enter into an agreement that specifically deals with use, goods, restrictions on use and any other relevant details along these lines. This ends the present case and avoids future controversies about registration and use rights. We hope to hear back from you at your earliest convenience. Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Joseph R. Dreitler